



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,060	03/23/2004	Jonathan Maron	100202433-2	4057
22879 7590 09/18/2009 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			EXAMINER JOHNSON, JOHNESE T	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/807,060
Filing Date: March 23, 2004
Appellant(s): MARON, JONATHAN

Charles W. Griggers
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed May 18, 2009 appealing from the Office action mailed December 16, 2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2002/0188538	Robertson	12-2002
2003/0050932	Pace	03-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. (2002//0188538) in view of Pace et al. (US. PG. Pub. No. 2003/0050932).

As to claim 1, Robertson et al. disclose:

A method to provide a service in a controlled run-time environment,
comprising:

registering a proxy service in said controlled run-time environment wherein said proxy service implements an interface defined according to said controlled run-time environment (see paragraph [0153]) configured to services operating in said controlled run-time environment to interoperate with said proxy service (see paragraph [0193]);

receiving service information by said proxy service from a local service executing in said controlled run-time environment via an interface method of said proxy service (see paragraph [0253]);

determining by said proxy service whether the received service information is valid for a remote service requested to be invoked by said proxy service, wherein an exception is returned to said local service from said proxy service without communication of invalid service information to said remote service when a determination of invalid service information is made by said proxy service (see

paragraph [0286]);

However, Robertson et al. does not explicitly disclose:

communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy service

when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service;

receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said

communicating; and

returning said processed information to said local service from said proxy service.

Pace et al. disclose:

communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy service

when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service

(see paragraph [0908], lines 1-9);

receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said

communicating (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9); and

returning said processed information to said local service from said proxy service (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Robertson et al. by the teachings of Pace et al. to fulfill an object request because previous methods were too slow and costly (see Pace et al. paragraphs [0907] – [0908]).

As to claims 2 and 18, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said proxy service is an object of a class that is instantiated by said controlled run-time environment (see Pace et al. paragraph [0053]).

As to claims 3 and 13, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said controlled run-time environment means instantiates said object in a partition (see Pace et al. paragraph [0908], lines 4-9) and only permits services operating in said partition to access said proxy service (see Pace et al. paragraph [0440]; wherein EJBs extend the attributes of Java thereby delivering access security).

As to claim 4, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said communicating service information comprises:

encapsulating said service information in an extensible mark-up language (XML) file (see Pace et al. [0317]; wherein information can be in the form of a java servlet and JSP and the JSP is in xml).

As to claims 5 and 14, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

security management means for exposing said proxy service only when said security management means determines access is permitted according to security parameters (see Pace et al. paragraph [0398]; wherein EJBs extend the attributes of Java thereby delivering access security).

As to claim 6, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said exposing comprises: determining user-level authorization from said security parameters (see Pace et al. paragraph [0322], lines 22-27; wherein the EJB container manages access of multiple users).

As to claim 7 Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said exposing comprises: determining process-level authorization from said security parameters (see Pace et al. paragraph [0067]; wherein the container manages control of transactions).

As to claims 8 and 15, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

further comprising: creating a log of access to said remote service (see Pace et al. paragraph [0750]).

As to claims 9 and 16, Pace Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said communicating said service information comprises: performing a remote procedure call (see Pace et al. paragraph [0477] – performs RMI) .

As to claim 10, Robertson et al. disclose:

A system to provide a modular software service, comprising:

controlled run-time environment means for managing processes (see paragraph [0193]);

service registry means for registering services operating in said controlled run-time

environment means, wherein at least one registered service is a proxy service means (see paragraph [153]);

said proxy service means implementing an interface defined according to said controlled run-time environment means for enabling services operating in said controlled run-time environment means to interoperate with said proxy service means, said proxy service means comprising:

means for receiving service information by said proxy service means from a local service executing in said controlled run-time environment means (see paragraph [253]);

means for determining by said proxy service whether the received service information is valid for a remote service requested to be invoked by said proxy service, wherein an exception is returned to said local service from said proxy service without communication of invalid service information to said remote service when a determination of invalid service information is made by said proxy service (see paragraph [0286]);

However, Robertson et al. does not explicitly disclose:

means for communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy service when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service means;

means for receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicated service information; and

means for returning said processed information to said local.

Pace et al. disclose:

means for communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy service when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service means (see paragraph [0908], lines 1-9);

means for receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicated service information (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9); and

means for returning said processed information to said local service (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Robertson et al. by the teachings of Pace et al. to fulfill an object request because previous methods were too slow and costly (see Pace et al. paragraphs [0907] – [0908]).

As to claims 11 and 19, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said proxy service means further comprises:

means for verifying said service information that is operable before said means for communicating (see paragraph [0121], lines 6-11, and paragraph [0190], lines 1-5).

As to claims 12 and 20, Robertson et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein said proxy service means further comprises:

means for communicating with a distributed service registry to identify said remote service (see paragraph [0477]).

As to claim 17, Robertson et al. disclose:

A computer-readable medium that comprises executable instructions for providing a service in a controlled run-time environment, said executable instructions comprising (see paragraph [0113]) - software):

code for registering (see paragraph [0113]) a proxy service in said controlled run-time environment wherein said proxy service implements an interface defined according to said controlled run-time environment to enable services operating in said controlled run-time environment (see paragraph [0153]) configured to services operating in said controlled run-time environment to interoperate with said proxy service (see paragraph [0193]);

coded for receiving (see paragraph [0113]) service information by said proxy service from a local service executing in said controlled run-time environment via an interface method of said proxy service (see paragraph [0253]);

code for determining by said proxy service whether the received service information is valid for a remote service requested to be invoked by said proxy service, wherein an exception is returned to said local service from said proxy service without communication of invalid service information to said remote service when a determination of invalid service information is made by said proxy service (see paragraph [0286]);

However, Robertson et al. does not explicitly disclose:

code for communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy

service;
code for receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicating; and
code for returning said processed information to said local service from said proxy service.

Pace et al. disclose:

code for communicating said service information to a remote service from said proxy service when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service means (see paragraph [0908], lines 1-9);
code for receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicating (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9); and
code for returning said processed information to said local service from said proxy service (see paragraph [0908], lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Robertson et al. by the teachings of Pace et al. to fulfill an object request because previous methods were too slow and costly (see Pace et al. paragraphs [0907] – [0908]).

(10) Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed 5-18-2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments that "determining" by said proxy service whether the received service information is valid for a remote service requested to be invoked by said proxy service, wherein an exception is returned to said local service from said

proxy service without communication of invalid service information to said remote service when a determination of invalid service information is made by said proxy service; communicating said service information to said remote service from said proxy service when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service; receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicating" is not taught by Pace nor Robertson is acknowledged, but it not deemed persuasive.

Robertson, as cited, discloses "determining by said proxy service whether the received service information is valid for a remote service requested to be invoked by said proxy service, wherein an exception is returned to said local service from said proxy service without communication of invalid service information to said remote service when a determination of invalid service information is made by said proxy service". In paragraph [0286], a service requests to be invoked by the proxy. The proxy then begins an iterative check to determine if the service results in a stale exception. If the exception does not occur, the proxy continues it's check.

Pace is cited for disclosing "communicating said service information to said remote service from said proxy service when a determination of valid service information is made by said proxy service; receiving processed information from said remote service in response to said communicating". Based on the examiner's interpretation, these limitations are disclosed in paragraph [0908], lines 1-9. Pace discloses that a check is made to determine if an asset adapter will handle this fault and a proxy request or redirection is performed to access the source asset. A proxy object

accepts the request, calls the CDS/ADS, which in turn calls the EDA on the source, which performs the call within the source environment, and returns the result to the CDS/ADS, which returns the result to the CDA, and the CDA returns the result to the proxy object, the proxy object returns the results to the caller.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Johnese Johnson/

Examiner, Art Unit 2166

September 13, 2009

Conferees:

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166

/Pierre M. Vital/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2156